



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,810	06/21/2000	Matthew J. Kotler	MSI-580US	8040
22801	7590	06/28/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			TRAN, QUOC A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/599,810

Applicant(s)

KOTLER ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2005.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-15, 17-38, 50, 51, 64, 68 and 69 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8, 10, 12-15, 17-38, 50, 51, 64, 68 and 69 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/7/05 & 5/24/04.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in responses to Amendment A filed 04/06/2005. Applicant's amended claims 2, 4, 8 14, 17 and cancelled claim 9 and 16. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 14, 23, 32, 50, 64 and 68 are independent claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

**(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.**

**Claims 68-69** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Bruce Hallberg et al. "Using Microsoft Excel 97" (Public Release 1997, By Que Corporation) (hereinafter Hallberg).

**In regard to independent claim 68**, "*A user interface comprising: a first spreadsheet table supporting spreadsheet functionality and having multiple cells*", as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 1 pages 21-22 (i.e...Excel worksheet using the mouse or keyboard...to move from cell to cell...),

*"and a second spreadsheet table nested within a cell of the first table"*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 3 pages 112-113 (i.e...Referencing Formulas from Other Worksheet and Workbooks...cells...).

**In regard to independent claim 69**, *“wherein one of the first and second tables contains a formula referencing contents of the other of the first and second tables”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 3 pages 112-113 (i.e....Referencing Formulas from Other Worksheet and Workbooks...).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-10, 12-38, 50-51 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruce Hallberg et al. “Using Microsoft Excel 97” (Public Release 1997, By Que Corporation) (hereinafter Hallberg), in view of Koppolu et al. US Patent No. 5,801,701 issued 08/01/1998 filed 09/04/1996 (hereinafter ‘701).**

**In regard to independent claim 1**, *“presenting a free floating field configured for insertion into the document”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 3 pages 99-101 FIG. 3.13 – 3.14 (i.e....any time...pass the pointer over a cell ...comments box pops up...choose Insert, edit comments...),

Hallberg does not explicitly disclose, *“presenting a word processing table within a document; and exhibiting spreadsheet features together with the word processing table when a*

*user is editing the word processing table*", however as taught by '701 at col. 8, lines 25-32 (i.e... FIG. 4 is a diagram of the embedded spreadsheet object as it appears when activated in place within the compound document. The spreadsheet object 405 is edited directly in the client window 404 of the word processing application...),

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Koppolu into Hallberg to provide a way, wherein resending a word processing table within a document; and exhibiting spreadsheet features together with the word processing table when a user is editing the word processing table. One of the ordinary skills in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide a sharing data between word processing program and spreadsheet program, wherein the spreadsheet program can be used to manipulate data that is in spreadsheet format. Thus, if a user wants to modify, for example, the budgeting data that is in the compound document, the user starts the spreadsheet program, loads in the budgeting data from a file, makes the modifications, copies the modifications to the clipboard, starts the word processing program, loads in the compound document, and pastes the modified clipboard data into the compound document. The spreadsheet program "implements" the spreadsheet data, that is, the spreadsheet program can be used to manipulate data that is in spreadsheet format. The format that a program implements is referred to as native format, as taught by '701 at col. 2, lines 13-26 (i.e... word processing program 206, loads in the compound document 101, and pastes the modified clipboard data into the compound document 101. The spreadsheet program...).

**In regard to dependent claim 2**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

*“wherein the document is a markup document, and the presenting comprises rendering the markup document”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 26 pages 650-652 FIG. 26.9 – 26.10 (i.e...worksheet...posting on the web ...to an HTML page:...).*

**In regard to dependent claim 3**, *“wherein the word processing table has rows and columns, and the exhibiting comprises depicting row headers for the rows and column headers for the columns”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 1 pages 18-20 FIG. 1.2 (i.e... Excel Screen Elements ...Rows..Columns...).*

**In regard to independent claim 4**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

*“wherein the word processing table has rows and columns, and the exhibiting comprises depicting a row addition control for adding one or more rows to the word processing table and a column addition control for adding one or more columns to the word processing table”, as taught by Hallberg, chapter 3, pages 125-126 (i.e...Insert and Delete Rows and Columns...).*

**In regard to independent claim 5**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

*“determining, upon selection of a cell in the word processing table, a type of contents in the cell; and interpreting user entry based upon the type of contents in the cell”, as taught by*

Hallberg at Chapter 4 pages 145-147 FIG. 4.19-4.21 (i.e...Applying Conditional Formatting...cell formatting for cell automatically change upon value change...).

**In regard to dependent claim 6**, “*evaluating whether the type of contents is a formula or non-text data; if the type of contents is a formula or non-text data, interpreting the user entry as applicable to spreadsheet functions; and if the type of contents is not a formula or non-text data, interpreting the user entry as applicable to word processing functions*”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 4 pages 145-147 FIG. 4.19-4.21 (i.e...Applying Conditional Formatting...cell formatting for cell automatically change upon value change...).

**In regard to dependent claim 7**, “*evaluating whether the type of contents is a formula if the type of contents is a formula, highlighting all of the formula and allowing editing in a formula edit box; and if the type of contents is not a formula, placing a cursor in the cell*”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 6 pages 196-199 FIG. 6.6-4.6.7 (i.e...Formula Palette...FIG6.7...formula being edited...).

**In regard to independent claim 8**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

“*wherein the word processing table has multiple cells*”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 1 pages 21-22 (i.e...Excel worksheet ....move from cell to cell...),

“*the method further comprising overlaying a formula edit box on a particular cell in the table to facilitate user entry of a formula into the particular cell*”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 6 pages 196-199 FIG. 6.6-4.6.7 (i.e...Formula Palette temporarily shrinks out of your way as shown in FIG. 6.7...formula being edited...).

*“resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while maintaining the particular cell and table as a whole at a constant size”*, Hallberg at pages 190-201 Chapter 6, disclose method for using Excel function, wherein Fig. 6.6 and 6.12 illustrating the collapse/expand buttons and the nested function using the formula palette in the expanding mode then paste the function back into the pallet with the default size and style, is reasonably equivalent to the concept of resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while maintaining the particular cell and table as a whole at a constant size as claimed.

**In regard to dependent claim 10**, *“presenting multiple word processing tables”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 1 pages 25-26 FIG. 1.5 (i.e...Multiple Workbooks...),

*“enabling a user to reference a cell in a first word processing table when entering a formula in a cell in a second word processing table”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 3 pages 112-113 (i.e...Referencing Formulas from Other Worksheet and Workbooks...).

**In regard to dependent claim 12**, *“modifying a value in a cell of the word processing table; and upon modification, automatically recalculating any formula in the word processing table that is affected by the modification”*, as taught by Hallberg at pages 5-8 FIG. 1.5-FIG. 1.9 (i.e... AutoCalculate...Formula Palette...).

**In regard to dependent claim 13**, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 1 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 14**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 above, and further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;



*“overlaying a formula edit box on a particular cell in the table to facilitate user entry of a formula into the particular cell”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 6 pages 196-199 FIG. 6.6-FIG. 6.7 (i.e...Formula Palette temporarily shrinks out of your way as shown in FIG. 6.7...formula being edited...),

*“resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula”*, Hallberg at pages 190-201 Chapter 6, disclose method for using Excel function, wherein Fig. 6.6 and 6.12 illustrating the collapse/expand buttons and the nested function using the formula palette in the expanding mode then paste the function back into the pallet with the default size and style, is reasonably equivalent to the concept of resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while maintaining the particular cell and table as a whole at a constant size as claimed.

**In regard to dependent claim 15**, *“wherein the formula edit box initially defaults to a size and shape of the particular cell in the table”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 6 pages 196-199 FIG. 6.6- FIG. 6.7 (i.e...Formula Palette temporarily shrinks out of your way as shown in FIG. 6.7. After choosing the cell or cells you need, click the Collapse/Expand button... to restore the Formula Palette...).

**In regard to dependent claim 17**, *“maintaining the particular cell and table at a constant size”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 6 pages 196-199 FIG. 6.6-4.6.7 (i.e...Formula Palette temporarily shrinks out of your way as shown in FIG. 6.7...formula being edited...).

**In regard to dependent claim 18**, *“extending the formula edit box horizontally and subsequently enlarging the formula edit box vertically as the user enters the formula”*, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 7 pages 227-226 FIG. 7.18 (i.e... =INDEX(‘Quote Price’\$A\$...)). Examiner reads that the auto enlarge is embed in the excel program, wherein user can view and

edit oversize of the look up results, such as edit box extended in both direction horizontally and vertically as show in FIG 7.18, which could interpreted as claimed “extending ... horizontally and ... vertically”.

**In regard to dependent claim 19**, “*enabling a user to reference another cell in the table to add a reference to the formula*”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 3 pages 107-111 Fig. 3.19- Fig. 3.22 (i.e...see page 108... 2. Select the first cell...include in the formula...).

**In regard to dependent claim 20**, “*presenting multiple tables*”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 1 pages 24-25 (i.e...sheet1, sheet2 and so on...),

“and to enabling a user to reference a cell in another table to add a variant to the formula”, as taught by Hallberg at Chapter 3 pages 112-113 (i.e...Referencing Formulas from Other Worksheet and Workbooks...).

**In regard to dependent claim 21**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 and 20 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 22**, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 14 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to claims 23-28** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10 and 14 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 29**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10, 12, 14 and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 30**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, 10, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 31**, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 23, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 32**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 10, 14 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 33**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 34**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 10, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 35**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 12, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 36**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 18, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 37**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, 10, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 38**, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 23, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 50**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, and 5 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 51**, is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 23, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 64**, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, and 4 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

### ***Response to Argument***

6. Applicant's Remark filed 04/06//2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The reason for rejection is set forth in the rejection state above and further more of the following:

#### **Reponses to argument claim 68-69, Remarks pages 21-23:**

Applicant argues, that Hallberg fail to teach and/or suggest the concept of nested a second spreadsheet table within a cell of the first table. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason of rejection is set forth in the rejection above. In further support of the current rejection, please note the following: Hallberg at pages 581-590 chapter 24, Fig. 24.6-24.7, discloses the method of managing objects and links, wherein provides steps of activating and embedding word document, is reasonably equivalent to nested a second spreadsheet table within a cell of the first table as claimed. Therefor Independent claim 68 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims such as claim 69.

#### **Reponses to argument claim 1-4, 10, 12-13, 21 Remarks pages 24-27, 31, 32:**

Applicant argues, that Hallberg fail to teach and/or suggest the concept of enabling a user to reference a cell in the word processing table when entering a formula into the free floating field. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason of rejection is set forth in the rejection above. In further support of the current rejection, please note the following: It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Koppolu into Hallberg to include a means of interacting within the compound document; Since word processors typically process only text data, users of the word processing program can move

or delete embedded data, but cannot modify embedded data, unless the data is in text format. Thus, if a user wants to modify, for example, a budgeting data that is in a compound document 1, the user starts the spreadsheet program, loads in the budgeting data from a file, makes the modifications, copies the modifications to the clipboard, starts the word processing program, loads in the compound document, and pastes the modified clipboard data into the compound document. The spreadsheet program "implements" the spreadsheet data, that is, the spreadsheet program can be used to manipulate data that is in spreadsheet format, see Koppolu at col. 2, lines 10-25. Also Koppolu at col. 13, lines 1-10, disclose a typically, tool bars and other application-specific tools are attached to either the frame window or a pane window of a container application. They may also appear as floating palettes, which are windows that are independent of the windows shown in FIG. 11 and thus appear to "float" on top, which is reasonably equivalent to the claimed limitation, i.e. free floating field. Therefore claims 1-4 remain rejected.

**Responses to argument claims 5-7, Remarks pages 27-30:**

Applicant argues, that Hallberg fail to teach and/or suggest the concept of evaluate the type contents of user input whether it is a formula or non-text data. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason of rejection is set forth in the rejection above. In further support of the current rejection, please note the following: Hallberg at pages 85-89 Chapter 3, disclose method for entering and editing data, a worksheet contain three basics types of entries text, value and formula that has to be input correctly, moreover Hallberg at pages 209-210 Chapter 6, disclose method for detecting user input error while creating using Excel function, Examiner reads the above concept in the broadest reasonable interpretation the claimed invention, wherein the #NULL Error, #REF! Error, # Num! Error and so on, is reasonably equivalent to evaluate the

type contents of user input whether it is a formula or non-text data as claimed. Therefor claims 5-7 remain rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims such as claims 10, 12-13 and 21.

**Reponses to argument claims 8, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22 and 23-28, Remarks pages 30-34:**

Applicant argues, that Hallberg fail to teach and/or suggest the concept of resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while maintaining the particular cell and table as a whole at a constant size. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason of rejection is set forth in the rejection above. In further support of the current rejection, please note the following: Hallberg at pages 190-201 Chapter 6, disclose method for using Excel function, wherein Fig. 6.6 and 6.12 illustrating the collapse/expand buttons and the nested function using the formula palette in the expanding mode then paste the function back into the pallet with the default size and style, is reasonably equivalent to the concept of resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while maintaining the particular cell and table as a whole at a constant size as claimed. Therefor claims 8 remains rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims such as claims 14, 17, 20, 22 and 23-28.

As for argument of claim 15, Applicant argues, that Hallberg fail to teach and/or suggest the concept of the formula edit box initially defaults to a size and shape of the particular cell in the table. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason of rejection is set forth in the rejection above. In further support of the current rejection, please note the following: Hallberg at pages 712-714 Chapter 28, disclose method for using VBE (Visual Basic Editor), which allow user set macros for the Excel project such as default value for formula box and so on, is reasonably

equivalent to defaults to a size and shape of the particular cell in the table as claimed. Therefor claims 15 remain rejected.

As for argument of claim 18, Applicant argues, that Hallberg fail to teach and/or suggest the concept of the formula edit box horizontally extended as the user enter the formula. The Office respectfully disagrees, the reason of rejection is set forth in the rejection above. In further support of the current rejection, please note the following: Hallberg at pages 712-714 Chapter 28, disclose method for using VBE (Visual Basic Editor), which allow user set macros for the Excel project such as default value for formula box and so on, is reasonably equivalent to defaults to a size and shape of the particular cell in the table as claimed. Therefor claims 18 remain rejected.

Since claims 1, 10, 8, 14, 12, 18, 26 and 23 remain rejected, which lead to the rejection of the intervening claims such as claims 29, 30-38, 50-51 and 64.

### ***Conclusion***

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2176

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) -272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

---

Quoc A. Tran

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2176

June 26, 2005

*William L. Bashore*  
WILLIAM BASHORE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
6/26/2005